



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/008,553	11/09/2001	Robert O. Aberg	MWS-009	6757

959 7590 11/24/2004

LAHIVE & COCKFIELD, LLP.
28 STATE STREET
BOSTON, MA 02109

EXAMINER

BRIER, JEFFERY A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2672

DATE MAILED: 11/24/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/008,553

Applicant(s)

ABERG ET AL.

Examiner

Jeffery A Brier

Art Unit

2672

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 9/20/2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-42 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 and 20-42 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 19 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Detailed Action

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 6/21/2004 has been entered.

Response to Amendment

2. The amendment filed on 6/21/2004 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicants arguments filed 6/21/2004 concerning the Schatz reference are not persuasive for the following reasons.

Applicants arguments present in the paragraph spanning pages 14 and 15 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive because the added limitation to claims 1, 15, 20, and 34 do not add all of the claim limitations indicated as making claim 5 allowable. The indication of allowability of claim 5 stated.

Claims 5-7, 17, 19 and 22:

The prior art of record fails to teach or suggest *categorizing said differences between said two diagrams as functional differences and graphical differences, copying all of said functional differences from said selected one of said two diagrams, and*

Art Unit: 2672

copying less than all of said graphical differences from said selected one of said two diagrams because the graphical representation of the diagram is very important to understanding the diagram and motivation to copy less than all of the graphical differences is not present in the prior art of record.

The claim limitation that was not added to claims 1, 15, 20, and 34 is *copying all of said functional differences from said selected one of said two diagrams, and copying less than all of said graphical differences from said selected one of said two diagrams.*

Emphasis added.

Applicants arguments present in the first full paragraph on page 15 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive because the added limitation to claims 18 and 25 do not overcome the Schatz reference. The argued limitation "that the semantic connection associates components within the same system an electronic diagram" is not taught by Schatz is incorrect. This type of connection in the diagram is taught by Schatz by the attributes which identifies diagram components to a diagram and by Schatz when a component's sub system is analyzed since all of the components of the sub system do not have a direct connection to each other but they are semantically associated with the same sub system. See column 1 lines 53-55 and 59-62, column 2 lines 31-34, column 3 lines 51-57, column 4 lines 11-16, and column 5 lines 6-16 for various semantic connections that associates within the same system an electronic diagram. Also column 11 lines 5-8 teaches to merge diverse diagrams each diverse diagram is formed from known resources or systems.

Applicants arguments present in the last full paragraph on page 15 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive because Schatz does teach distinguishing

Art Unit: 2672

between functional and graphical differences. Functional differences are described at column 11 lines 8-12 as resources flowing within nodes, at lines 24-27 as resources flowing between nodes of different systems, and at column 12 lines 1-9 adds the functions of internal flows to the merged diagram. Graphical differences are described at column 11 lines 11-20 which describes displaying differences between the original diagram and the merged diagram by adding a system u to the original diagram. The display of differences entails the determination of graphical differences from the functional differences between the diagrams to be merged. Thus, when two or more diagrams are merged their functional differences are determined and consequentially their graphical differences have been determined since the graphical appearance of each diagram is a function of functions. For example a backdrop which is described at column 3 lines 64 to column 4 line 2, column 8 lines 16-18, and column 10 line 20 is generated based upon the functions and for a merged diagram the functional differences will create different backdrops since system u will add different backdrops to the original diagram and the synthesis of the two may result in a backdrop the covers portions of system u and the original diagram due to similar related nodes. Column 3 lines 64 to column 4 line 2 states:

Backdrop: rectangular element or the like in a network diagram which is positioned logically behind or around a box or group of related boxes or nodes. The backdrop represents a group related to a subgroup which in turn can be represented by a box positioned logically in front of or within the backdrop in the network diagram.

However, as stated above this reference fails to teach copying less than all of the graphical differences since when the functional differences control the generation of the graphical differences then all of the graphical differences are displayed.

It should be noted that the Hsu reference teaches comparing the functional attributes and the cosmetic attributes between two diagrams to determine functional differences and the cosmetic differences. See column 9 lines 54-63, column 14 lines 10-26, and column 15 lines 59-67. Hsu does not teach copying less than all of the graphical differences from one of the diagrams to another diagram.

Claim Objections

4. Claim 14 is objected to because of the following informalities: In claim 14 a period appears to be lacking at the end of the claim. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claims 1-17 and 20-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1:

At lines 9 and 10 "said diagram" lacks antecedent basis in the claim because previously two diagrams were claimed.

Art Unit: 2672

Claim 12:

At line 2 it is not clear if "a highlighted item" is the same "a highlighted item" found in claim 11 line 5 or a different "highlighted item".

Claim 5:

The step of programmatically merging and the step of inserting the copied seem to be performing the same function. It seems the step of programmatically merging should be deleted from the claim.

In the last line "the corresponding section" lacks antecedent basis in the claim.

Claim 9:

In the determining a distance step it is not clear which diagram "said electronic diagram" refers to since there are two electronic diagrams and which line and block "a line and a block refers to since a line and a block already are recited in the claim.

In the extending step "said displayed arrowed line" lacks antecedent basis in the claim.

Claim 15:

At lines 9 and 10 "said electronic diagram" lacks antecedent basis in the claim because these claims claim "state diagrams".

Claim 20:

At lines 9 and 10 "said electronic diagram" lacks antecedent basis in the claim because previously two diagrams were claimed.

Art Unit: 2672

Claim 23:

In the determining differences step it is not clear if the determined differences are differences present in the at least one additional electronic diagram or as stated in claim 20 determining differences between said electronic diagrams or determining differences between said additional electronic diagram and some unclaimed element.

In the merging step it is not clear which electronic diagrams the additionally differences are merged into. Also it not clear if the differences should be merged into all of the electronic diagrams.

Claim 24:

In the determining differences step it is not clear if the determined differences are differences present in the at least one additional electronic diagram or as stated in claim 20 determining differences between said electronic diagrams or determining differences between said additional electronic diagram and some unclaimed element.

In the merging step it is not clear if the claimed "a single electronic diagram" is the "said other electronic diagram" of claim 20 or a different electronic diagram.

Claim 25:

At lines 5 and 6 "said electronic diagram" lacks antecedent basis in the claim because previously two diagrams were claimed.

Claim 29:

At line 2 "a display surface of a display device" is claimed while in parent claim 25 "a display surface" is also claimed. It is not clear if the "display surface" in this claim is the same "display surface" found in claim 25 or a different "display surface".

Art Unit: 2672

Claim 30:

At line 2 "a display surface of a display device" is claimed while in parent claim 25 "a display surface" is also claimed. It is not clear if the "display surface" in this claim is the same "display surface" found in claim 25 or a different "display surface".

Claim 34:

At lines 12 and 13 "said electronic diagram" lacks antecedent basis in the claim because previously two diagrams were claimed.

Claim 38:

This claim has the same problem that claim 29 has. At line 3 "a display surface of a display device" is claimed while in parent claim 34 "a display surface" is also claimed. It is not clear if the "display surface" in this claim is the same "display surface" found in claim 34 or a different "display surface".

Claim 39:

This claim has the same problem that claim 30 has. At line 3 "a display surface of a display device" is claimed while in parent claim 34 "a display surface" is also claimed. It is not clear if the "display surface" in this claim is the same "display surface" found in claim 34 or a different "display surface".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2672

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

8. Claims 1-4, 13-16, 18, 20, 21, 23-28, 32-37, 41 and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Schatz et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,845,270.

Schatz describes comparing at least two electronic diagrams, column 1 lines 41-45, and merging at least two electronic diagrams, column 10 line 65 to column 11 line 21, and Schatz also describes comparing at least two state diagrams, column 1 lines 36-39, and merging at least two state diagrams, column 10 line 65 to column 11 line 21.

A detailed analysis of the claims follows.

Claim 1:

Schatz teaches in an electronic device (*see figure 6, computer system 600 is an electronic device since it uses an magnetic disk, column 5 line 38, and since it uses a cathode ray tube for a display, column 5 line 42*) interfaced with a display surface (*column 5 lines 40-43 discusses various displays 621 connected to computer 600*), a method, comprising the steps of:

providing two electronic diagrams (*Schatz discusses circuit diagrams used in electrical engineering as being the types of diagrams Schatz compares and merges at column 1 lines 41-45*), said electronic

Art Unit: 2672

diagrams having blocks (*electrical components are often grouped as blocks in electrical circuit diagrams, such as used in depicting an integrated circuit, microprocessor, memory, etc.*) representing components of a system;

determining corresponding features of said electronic diagrams that are present in both of said electronic diagrams (*in the merging of diagrams Schatz determines redundant diagram features, see column 11 lines 49-52 and 64-67*);

determining differences between said electronic diagrams (*in the merging of diagrams Schatz determines differences between diagram features when at least the redundant diagram features are determined, see column 11 lines 49-52 and 64-67*), said differences categorized as functional differences (*The flow between nodes, the flow between systems, the flow between nodes in a subsystem, the flow between subsystem nodes of one system to subsystem nodes of another system are examples of functions of the diagrams and during the merging process differences between the two diagrams are determined in order to form the merged diagram.*) and graphical differences (*Graphical differences are related to the display of the merged diagrams and are a function of the functional differences.*), said functional differences controlling the performance of a system

Art Unit: 2672

represented by said electronic diagram, said graphical differences affecting the appearance of said electronic diagram displayed to a user; and

programmatically merging said determined differences (*column 11 line 38-67 describes merging at least two diagrams*) by copying said determined differences from a selected one of said two electronic diagrams into the other of said electronic diagrams at a corresponding location in said other electronic diagram (*Schatz merges one diagram into a second diagram when at column 11 line, column 9 lines 54-60, s 12-15 where Schatz wrote "It should be understood that a merged network diagram may be displayed as an extension of either the of the original network diagrams or a new network diagram" and at column 11 lines 49-52 and 64-67 Schatz describes removing duplicate trees, this merges the differences from one into the other diagram*).

Claim 2:

Schatz teaches the method of claim 1 wherein said programmatically merging differences comprises the further step of:

replacing data elements of said other electronic diagram with copied differences from said selected one of said two electronic diagrams (*when the merged diagram is an extension of one of the diagrams then it receives diagram components and when the difference is additional attributes for a corresponding diagram component exists in a second diagram*

Art Unit: 2672

then the second diagram's component replaces the first diagram's component).

Claim 3:

Schatz teaches the method of claim 2, comprising the further step of:

cascading hierarchically the replacement of data elements wherein said data elements being replaced are arranged in a tree structure (*Schatz discusses at column 11 lines 28-35 and 42-47 replacing the tree structure of one diagram with the tree structure of another diagram during the merge process*), said tree structure having parent data elements with child data elements attached thereto, said child data elements being replaced when said parent data element is replaced (*when a tree structure is replaced the child data associated with parent data is replaced*).

Claim 4:

Schatz discusses at column 4 lines 28-30 trees that are overlapping, thus, the parent nodes of two diagrams may be the same but the child nodes may have differences causing the child node in the second diagram to replace the child node in the first diagram, thus Schatz teaches the method of claim 3 wherein only said child data elements are replaced.

Art Unit: 2672

Claim 13:

The specific diagrams discussed in the Schatz's description of the related art are the diagrams that Schatz merges. Schatz teaches the method of claim 1, wherein said two electronic diagrams are one of

block diagrams (*Schatz teaches block diagrams at column 1 lines 40-42 since economic diagrams are block diagrams*),

state diagrams (*Schatz teaches state diagrams at column 1 lines 36-39*),

signal diagrams (*Schatz teaches signal diagrams at column 1 lines 34-37 and 41-45 since telecommunication or data communication networks and electrical circuit represent signal flow through the network*),

flow chart diagrams (*Schatz teaches flow charts at column 1 lines 37-40 because state diagrams are flow charts*),

sequence diagrams (*Schatz teaches sequence diagrams at column 1 lines 40-43 since the flow of currency is time related thus the economic diagrams are sequence diagrams*), UML diagrams (*Unified Modeling Language diagrams is not expressly taught by Schatz but since at column 1 line 40 Schatz discusses diagrams that model computer programs then Schatz inherently contemplates comparing and merging UML diagrams*),

Art Unit: 2672

dataflow diagrams (*Schatz teaches dataflow diagrams at column 1 lines 34-39 and 41-45 since telecommunication or data communication networks, state transition diagrams and electrical circuit represent data flow through the network*), circuit diagrams (*Schatz teaches circuit diagrams at column 1 lines 41-45*),

ladder logic diagrams (*this is covered by the electrical circuit diagrams because ladder circuits and ladder logic circuits are used in electrical engineering*) and

Kinematic element diagrams (*a kinematic element diagram is a diagram that shows kinematic flow, this is inherent since at column 1 lines 19-25 Schatz describes general system modeling*).

Claim 14:

Schatz discusses at column 11 lines 5-8 aggregates which has multiple domains since a diagram may be an aggregate of several systems each having its own unique domain.

Claim 15:

This claim is similar to claim 1. The difference is claim 1 claimed an electronic diagram while this claim claims a state diagram. Both types of diagrams are discussed at column 1 lines 37-45. This claim is rejected for the reasons given for claim 1 and in view of the fact that state diagrams are compared and merged by Schatz.

Art Unit: 2672

Claim 16:

See the discussion of claim 2.

Claim 18:

This claim is similar to claim 1. The difference is this claim is claiming essentially the electronic device of claim 1 is connected to a network and having the electronic diagrams received by the electronic device over the network. Schatz teaches at column 6 lines 7-28 storing the data to be analyzed at a location different than the computer 600 and computer 600 is connected to a network LAN/WAN via network interface 603. Thus, the electronic diagrams compared and merged by Schatz are retrieved from a database via the network, stored locally, and then compared and merged. The claim limitation including "at least one semantic connection, said semantic connection associating components within the same system in said electronic diagram" is met by the attribute that semantically associates all of the diagram components to a diagram and is met by the attribute that semantically associates all of the sub system components to a particular subsystem. This type of connection in the diagram is taught by Schatz by the attributes which identifies diagram components to a diagram and by Schatz when a component's sub system is analyzed since all of the components of the sub system do not have a direct connection to each other but they are semantically associated with the same sub system. See column 1 lines 53-55 and 59-62, column 2 lines 31-34, column 3 lines 51-57, column 4 lines 11-16, and column 5 lines 6-16 for various semantic connections that associates within the same system an electronic

Art Unit: 2672

diagram. Also column 11 lines 5-8 teaches to merge diverse diagrams each diverse diagram is formed from known resources or systems.

Claim 20:

This claim is similar to claim 1, the difference is this claim claims *In an electronic device interfaced with a display surface, a medium holding computer-executable instructions for a method* where the method is the same method claimed in claim 1. Schatz discusses at column 5 lines 29-30 and column 6 lines 14-17 storing instructions for the processes executed by the processor 602 in main memory 604. Main memory 604 is a medium holding the computer executable instructions for performing the comparing and merging.

Claim 21:

See claim 2.

Claim 23:

Schatz teaches the medium of claim 20 wherein said method comprises the additional steps of:

determining differences in at least one additional electronic diagram (*in the merging of diagrams Schatz determines differences between diagram features when at least the redundant diagram features are determined, see column 11 lines 49-52 and 64-67*); and

Art Unit: 2672

merging said differences from at least one additional electronic diagram into said electronic diagrams (column 11 line 38-67 describes merging at least two diagrams, column 11 lines 49-52 and 64-67 describes removing duplicate trees this step merges the differences from one into the other diagram, Schatz merges one diagram into a second diagram when at column 11 lines 12-15 where Schatz wrote "It should be understood that a merged network diagram may be displayed as an extension of either the of the original network diagrams or a new network diagram").

Claim 24:

This claim is very similar to claim 23, the difference is this claim claims said diagram being stored in a configuration management system. The system of Schatz is considered to be a configuration management system since it configures a new system diagram.

Claim 25:

Claim 25 is unamended claim 1 with the semantic limitation added. For the reasons given above this additional limitation is taught by Schatz. The claim limitation including "at least one semantic connection, said semantic connection associating components within the same system in said electronic diagram" is met by Schatz for the reason given for claim 18.

Art Unit: 2672

Claim 26:

See the discussion of claim 2.

Claim 27:

See the discussion of claim 3.

Claim 28:

See the discussion of claim 4.

Claim 32:

See the discussion of claim 13.

Claim 33:

See the discussion of claim 14.

Claim 34:

This claim is a medium holding executable steps version of method claim 25 and is rejected for the reasons given for claim 25. Additionally Schatz teaches a computer system in figure 6 for performing the electronic diagram merging and teaches a executable instructions for performing the method stored in memory 606. The limitations added to this claim in the 6/21/2004 amendment is taught by Schatz for the reasons given in claim 1.

Claim 35:

See the discussion of claim 26.

Claim 36:

See the discussion of claim 27.

Art Unit: 2672

Claim 37:

See the discussion of claim 28.

Claim 41:

See the discussion of claim 32.

Claim 42:

See the discussion of claim 33.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 8, 11, 12, 29-31 and 38-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schatz et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,845,270 in view of Hsu, U.S. Patent No. 5,974,254.

Claim 8:

Claim 8 depends upon claim 1.

Schatz does teach *updating said display surface following the performance of said merging operation, said updating showing the differences copied to said other electronic diagram* because Schatz displays the merged electronic diagram, thus,

Art Unit: 2672

showing the differences copied into the other electronic diagram and applicant did not claim how these differences are displayed.

Schatz does not teach *highlighting the differences in said electronic diagrams for a user on a display surface of a display device, said display surface showing both of said diagrams.*

Hsu teaches *highlighting the differences in said electronic diagrams for a user on a display surface of a display device, said display surface showing both of said diagrams* at column 9 line 5 to column 10 line 67 and with reference to figure 4.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to display in Schatz both of the electronic diagrams and to highlight the differences between the two diagrams so the user will be able to quickly determine the merits of merging the two diagrams. The user needs this assistance because many diagrams are complex and the differences between the two or more diagrams may not be readily apparent without the aid of a computer highlighting the differences.

Claim 11:

Claim 11 depends upon claim 1

Schatz does teach replacing the difference item in said other electronic diagram with a copy of the difference item from a selected one of said two electronic diagrams.

Schatz does not teach *presenting said differences in said electronic diagrams on a display surface of a display device, said display surface split to show both of said electronic diagrams;*

Art Unit: 2672

highlighting a difference item in said selected one of said two electronic diagrams;
highlighting a difference item in said other electronic diagram that corresponds to the
matching highlighted difference in said selected one of said two electronic diagrams;
and
replacing the highlighted difference item in said other electronic diagram with a copy of
the highlighted difference item from said selected one of said two electronic diagrams.

Hsu teaches *highlighting the differences in said electronic diagrams for a user on*
a display surface of a display device, said display surface showing both of said
diagrams at column 9 line 5 to column 10 line 67 and with reference to figure 4.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to display in Schatz both of the electronic diagrams and to highlight the differences that will be subject to between the two diagrams so the user will be able to quickly determine the merits of merging the two diagrams and it would have been obvious to replace the highlighted difference in one diagram with the highlighted difference in the other diagram so the user will quickly know which items will be merged from one diagram into the other diagram. The user needs this assistance because many diagrams are complex and the differences between the two or more diagrams may not be readily apparent without the aid of a computer highlighting the differences and because the user would have difficulty in knowing what items have been merged from one diagram into the other diagram.

Claim 12:

Claim 12 depends upon claim 11. Schatz teaches replacing a data element in a highlighted (*above modification teaches highlighting*) difference item in said other electronic diagram, said data element being a child data element (*Schatz teaches tree structures see the discussion of claims 3, 4 and 12 above*) in said other electronic diagram, said data element being part of a tree structure, said tree structure having parent data elements with child data elements attached thereto (*see the discussion of claims 3, 4 and 12 above*).

Claim 29:

See the discussion of claims 25 and 8.

Claim 30:

See the discussion of claim 11.

Claim 31:

See the discussion of claim 12.

Claim 38:

See the discussion of claims 34 and 8.

Claim 39:

See the discussion of claim 30.

Claim 40:

See the discussion of claim 31.

Allowable Subject Matter

11. Claims 5-7, 9 and 10 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action.

12. Claims 17 and 22 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

13. Claim 19 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

14. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter.

Claims 5-7, 17, 19 and 22:

The prior art of record fails to teach or suggest *categorizing said differences between said two diagrams as functional differences and graphical differences, copying all of said functional differences from said selected one of said two diagrams, and copying less than all of said graphical differences from said selected one of said two diagrams* because the graphical representation of the diagram is very important to understanding the diagram and motivation to copy less than all of the graphical differences is not present in the prior art of record.

Claims 9 and 10:


The prior art of record fails to teach or suggest *determining a distance on said display surface from an endpoint of a line to an updated connection point for a block in said electronic diagram, said updated connection point being the connection point of a line and a block following a merge operation;*
comparing said distance to a pre-defined parameter, said pre-defined parameter being a distance value;
extending said displayed arrowed line to said updated connection point when said distance is less than said pre-defined parameter because Schatz at column 10 lines 28-47 distance is not discussed as being a parameter that controls the visual appearance of a line.

15. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeffery A Brier whose telephone number is 703-305-4723. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 6:30 to 3:00. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Razavi, can be reached at (703) 305-4713). The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

Art Unit: 2672

For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Jeffery A Brier
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2672